

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5 and 7-55 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, claim 13 is amended to correct a clerical error. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to the Applicants' numbering because there is no claim 6. Applicants hereby state for the record that claim 6 was not included in the original application, and therefore hereby disclaim any right in claim 6.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-10, 13-18, 21, 22, 24-27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34-43, 45, 46, and 48-55 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eisenhofer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,494) in view of Worthington et al. (U.S. Patent 5,881,270) and in further view of Eisenhofer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,339,836). The Office Action also rejects claims 3, 7, 20, 23, 28, 33, 36, 44, and 47 under 103(a) as being unpatentable over the aforementioned references and in further view of Ly et al. (U.S. Patent 6,175,946). The Office Action further rejects claims 11 and 12 under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eisenhofer et al. ('494) in view of Worthington et al. ('270) in further view of Eisenhofer et al. ('836) and in further view of Dearth et al. (U.S. Patent 5,881,267). Claims 11 and 12 are also rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eisenhofer et al. ('494) in view of Worthington et al. ('270) in further view of Eisenhofer et al. ('836) and in further view of Dearth et al. (U.S. Patent 5,732,247). Lastly, the Office Action rejects claim 19 under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eisenhofer et al. ('494) in view of Worthington et al. ('270) in further view of Eisenhofer et al. ('836) and in further view of Dearth et al. ('247).

The Office Action asserts that Eisenhofer ('494) teaches "data format conversions" at column 5 lines 52-67, column 6 lines 1-20, column 12 lines 34-67, and column 13 lines 1-5. Applicants respectfully assert that Eisenhofer does not disclose or suggest at least

“...operating each interface to convert the messages between a data format associated with the fixed configuration backplane and a data format associated with the simulator associated with the interface” as recited in independent claim 1.

In Eisenhofer, column 12 line 4 states: “[i]n addition to synchronizing the simulators, the simulation backplane 210 also performs data *type* conversion and transfers boundary event information, such as signal state”. Also, column 12 lines 34-61 states: “[t]herefore, before transferring the signal state from the source simulator to one or more target simulators, signal mapping (also referred to as data type conversion) is performed between the source and target representations in order to achieve consistent signal state representations. Exemplary conversions include the point-to-point signal mapping or mapping to intermediate simulation backplane types... Either conversion mechanism *may be implemented with a user-programmable state translation table*”.

Therefore, the Eisenhofer reference discloses taking elements of data of a first *type* and converting those elements to a second data *type* using a translation or “look-up” table.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited sections of Eisenhofer teach, suggest or reflect “...operating each interface to convert the messages between a data *format* associated with the fixed configuration backplane and a data *format* associated with the simulator associated with the interface”. For example, lines 15-19 of the specification disclose “[e]ach SDI (“software based simulator-dependent interfaces”) converts the exchanged messages between the *data format* supported by its corresponding simulator and the *data format* supported by the simulation backplane. Thus, *simulation backplane* 102 may implement a common data *format* when communicating with any simulator, driver or checker.”

Worthington ('270), Eisenhofer ('836), Ly ('946), Dearth ('267) and Dearth ('247) fail to make up for this deficiency. Therefore, since the implementation of a common data

ASSIGNEE: INTEL CORPORATION

*format* by the simulation backplane is not taught or suggested by Eisenhofer ('494) or the other aforementioned references, claim 1 is in condition for allowance and the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 21, 26, 29, 34, 40, 45, 51, 52, 53, 54, and 55 also contain the implementation of a common data *format* by the simulation backplane, and are therefore allowable for similar reasons. Furthermore, Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-20, 22-25, 27-28, 30-33, 35-39, 41-44, and 46-50 are allowable as depending from allowable base claims.

For at least the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Sumit Bhattacharya  
Sumit Bhattacharya  
(Registration No. 51,469)

Dated: June 9, 2003                          By:

KENYON & KENYON  
333 W. San Carlos St., Suite 600  
San Jose, CA 95110  
(408) 975-7500 telephone  
(408) 975-7501 facsimile